

And, yes, there is no question that we ought to look at the refining capacity of America. We have not built a new refinery in 16 years, I say to the occupant of the Chair.

What is that all about? It is because we have put environmental rules ahead of America's energy needs. We refuse to look at real cost benefits and reasonable mainstream protection rather than extraordinary protection that in many instances is meaningless but costly and many times stops the production of things such as refineries, pipelines, and the like.

I have much more that I will talk about from time to time on the floor of the Senate, but I come today to say, I hope we do not have to turn off our Christmas trees in New Mexico during this Christmas season, nor in the Senator's State of Colorado. I hope we can turn them back on in California.

Frankly, the only reason they cannot—and the only reason California suffers—is because nobody will make tough decisions. We are sitting back suggesting that things are really going well; that we will fix the American energy supply with windmills. I can deliver a specific talk on why that will not work for all our energy, but we ought to continue it. But it will never give us the kind of energy supply we need as we look to the future.

Do you know that the underdeveloped countries of the world, which intend to grow—and we say to them: Grow, prosper—by 2020 will use as much energy as the United States of America? Where are they going to get it? What are they going to use? What are we going to suggest they do?

Are we going to sit back and say America can grow but they can't? Are we going to say they can use some new kind of energy source but we won't?

So our leadership in the world, moving towards democratization and growth and prosperity for the poorest of nations, will come to a grinding halt if, in fact, we cannot have energy supply in the world.

Why should we have an agreement to preserve ambient air qualities and in that report not mention nuclear power? Why should leaders do that? I have had experts, physicists, who know what they are talking about, saying that alone is enough to put that document over here on a table and declare that it is not real.

If you want clean air in the future, you cannot say we will do it by using only natural gas, that we will not build any more coal burning powerplants, even though we could develop the technology to do that, that we will not consider nuclear power, even though we have a nuclear Navy that since 1954 has gone all through the waters of the seas and oceans of the world with it, with one or two powerplants right inside the hull of the boat, with never an accident. Never has anything happened,

and we are so frightened we will not even talk about it.

I think we will talk about it. I think we will talk about opening up American public domain for production. I think we will have a real debate about ANWR, rather than an emotional debate, a real one about what we ought to do to relate our energy needs to that area of the world, not just putting our hands up and saying it cannot be touched, that you can do nothing.

So there is much to be talked about and much leadership needed. But the point is, energy problems in America, without major changes, will get more pronounced. We will have more crises; the prices will go higher, not lower across the board in America for gasoline and natural gas.

I am hopeful the new President will put somebody in the Department of Energy who will help America address this issue with its eyes open, ready to make some really tough decisions.

But the biggest thing I seek is to set the record straight. When that occurs, as the energy crisis creeps across America, I hope we will remember that the seeds have been sown before the swearing in of this President. They are there; the lack of doing the right thing in America is already in place.

This President and his Cabinet and his Secretary and his Environmental Protection Agency head are going to have to help solve a crisis they did not create. We ought to know that, and we ought to set the record straight that that is the case.

I want to close by saying there is plenty of blame to go around. But we will not solve this problem without some leadership that is willing to tell us the truth and suggest that there is really no need for the State of California to be running out of electricity. It is because we have been shortsighted, misled—and they have been in their State because there is the potential for plenty of energy to go around out there. We just have to decide that America needs energy for its future, and that we cannot grow more dependent, that we ought to grow less dependent.

So rather than proceed with details about each of the sources of energy which I had chosen to talk about today, I will do that on another day. Suffice it to say, we will not continue to grow—the Federal Reserve Board notwithstanding—if we cannot solve the problem of how much energy we need and make sure we have it.

Some people thought that because of Silicon Valley, because it is so clean and because it is built around new technology and computerization, we would not need new energy sources. But it turns out that if you want that kind of growth and that kind of productivity increase, and if you want the future of our country to be built upon the technology that evolved with the

Silicon Valley in California and other mini "silicon valleys," you need a lot of energy to create the new productivity that that brings to America.

I want to also add that new technology, led by computerization, is part of the reason we have had the sustained growth; they added a dimension of productivity we did not even measure for many years. They added growth to technology by way of productivity increases: The more computers you had, the more you got out of your personnel per unit of work. You got more because of high technology. That has added immensely to our productivity and has permitted us to grow without inflation. That is peaking out.

Surely, if we do not add more energy to the mix of the base, we will have to start trading off one source of growth in America for another. I do not believe that is going to work, and somebody will be blamed, especially since it does not have to happen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SERVING IN THE SENATE

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today on what is a somewhat bitter-sweet occasion to reflect on my time in the Senate, and to look ahead to the future.

Next to being a husband, a father, and a grandfather, these past 6 years have provided without a doubt the most exciting and also the most inspiring moments in my life. To serve as a Member of the greatest deliberative body in the world—entrusted with fulfilling the hopes and wishes of the people across the United States as well as the people of Minnesota—has been humbling beyond words. When your view out the front window is of the U.S. Capitol, and when your daily travels take you down the same halls once walked by John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, and Daniel Webster, and you spend your hours working for people who ask nothing more of you than to make government work a little bit better, well, going to the office to work each day is a real pleasure.

I am going to miss the Senate, not at all because of the prestige it is said to represent, but because this relatively small group of people is instilled with the power to accomplish so much good. And every day in this Chamber, my colleagues plow their passions into doing that. Yes, we routinely disagree. We have our partisan battles. And as